



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,495	01/02/2001	Jeffrey H. Sherman	AVISTA/209-1014	2162

7590

09/03/2002

THOMASON, MOSER & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Blvd.
Houston, TX 77056

EXAMINER

NORTON, NADINE GEORGIANNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2002

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,495

Applicant(s)

SHERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Nadine Norton

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 and 11-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 and 11-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

Applicants' cancellation of claim 3 overcomes the previous 35 USC 101 double patenting rejection in paper no.12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Habiby et al.(4,021,333).

Applicants are claiming a process for purifying use oil comprising mixing the used oil with a phase transfer catalyst and removing contaminants from the oil. Applicants further claim that suitable phase transfer catalysts include glycols. Applicants also claim an additional step wherein a base is added (sodium or potassium hydroxide).

The reference of Habiby et al.(4,021,333) teaches a process for purifying used oil including the use of a glycol (the glycol meets applicants' phase transfer limitation). See column 2, lines 60-68 and column 3, lines 20-26. The process of Habiby et al.(4,021,333) also includes a step wherein a base is added to the used oil. Suitable bases include sodium hydroxide and potassium hydroxide in an amount of 0.5 to 5% by weight of the oil. See column 3, lines 56-67.

Habiby et al.(4,021,333) is considered to inherently encompass applicants' mixing step because the reference refers to a separation of phases (used oil/extractant) (column 3, lines 23-28). The "separation" indicates that two phases were initially mixed. In order for a separation to occur, two phases have to have been initially mixed together in some way to create a commingled mixture which would yield a separation.

Applicants' process is anticipated by the reference of Habiby et al.(4,021,333) because it discloses essentially the same process steps claimed by applicants.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 4-9 and 11-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,238,551.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a method of purifying used oil with a base and a phase transfer agent.

Art Unit: 1764

Claims 4-9 and 11-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,179,999.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a method of purifying used oil with a base a phase transfer agent.

Claims 4-9 and 11-38 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,319,394.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a method of purifying used oil with a base and a phase transfer agent.

Note: The Double Patenting Rejection over 6,007,701 in the office action of paper no.9 still remains in this case because the terminal disclaimer filed 11-30-01 is not proper. The terminal disclaimer is not proper because the attorney is not of record in the oath/declaration or a separate paper filed appointing a new attorney or associate attorney.

Note: Applicants are requested to attach a copy of the 1449 corresponding to the IDS filed 2/20/01 in paper no.3. The 1449 appears to be missing from the file.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed 6-21-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments that the reference of Habiby et al. (4,021,333) does not teach, show or suggest mixing used oil with a phase transfer catalyst in the presence of a base are not persuasive in overcoming the rejection.

The reference specifically discloses adding a base to the used oil prior to the preliminary step of a diluent (column 3, lines 35-40 and 56-65). The disclosure of the addition of a base meets applicants' limitation of "in the presence of a base". Next, the reference discloses that an extractant is added to the used oil. The extractant meets applicants' phase transfer agent limitation because the extractant is the same composition as applicants' phase transfer agent (e.g. a glycol). The reference's referral to the glycol as an extractant and not a "phase transfer catalyst" as claimed by applicants does not serve to distinguish applicants' claimed invention. The same composition (e.g. a glycol) contacted with a used oil performs the same function regardless of what it is called (phase transfer catalyst or extractant). In addition, mixing is considered to occur in the process of Habiby et al. (4,021,333) because the reference refers to a separation of phases (used oil/extractant) (column 3, lines 23-28). The "separation" indicates that two phases were initially mixed. In order for a separation of phases to occur, two phases have to have been initially mixed together in some way to create a commingled mixture which would yield to a separation.

Applicants' statements regarding the submission of terminal disclaimers upon allowance are acknowledged.

Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadine Norton whose telephone number is 703-305-2667. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marian Knode can be reached on 703-308-4311. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-4310 for regular communications and 703-872-4311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

N.N.

August 31, 2002

NADINE G. NORTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

